

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend Claim 11 as follows:

11. (Amended) ~~A~~ method of [operation] operating [of] a doctor blade chamber device in a printing unit in an offset machine [wherein the printing unit] comprising [a doctor chamber device is used for lacquer application and as dampening unit for water application] the step of:
shifting said doctor blade chamber device between a first position
transferring ink or damp to a roller being connected with an impression cylinder of
the printing unit to a second position without engagement with said roller to control
application of lacquer and water to the roller.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Applicant's Abstract and Disclosure based on informalities. Further, the Examiner rejected Claims 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite and rejected Claims 11- 20 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Applicant's Abstract for not being on a separate sheet. Therefore, Applicant has provided an Abstract on a separate sheet attached hereto. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Applicant's Disclosure for not having headings for various sections. Therefore, Applicant amended the specification by inserting the proper section headings as noted above. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant's amended Claim 11 now positively recites Applicant's method. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is submitted. Notice to that effect is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over GB 2,119,711("711") in view of EP 0,574,124 ("124"). Further, the Examiner rejected Claims 13-20 as obvious because the use of "wherein" clauses is language that suggest and makes optional but does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obvious rejection based on the use of "wherein". Applicant has properly used the language "wherein" in the dependent claims to further limit the method by adding apparatus limitations in the